



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/046,118	03/20/1998	CHARLES E. BOICE	EN998027	1827

7590 07/01/2003

KEVIN P RADIGAN ESQ  
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG PC  
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE  
ALBANY, NY 12203-5160

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WONG, ALLEN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	30

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/046,118	BOICE ET AL.
	Examiner Allen Wong	Art Unit 2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,10-28 and 31-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-6,9,29 and 30 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/03 have been fully read and considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding lines 14-17 on page 5 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that neither Reininger, Astle nor Pearlstein, taken separately or together, teach or suggest the artifact reduction when encoding frames with constant content from frame to frame. The examiner respectfully disagrees. On column 6, lines 25-47, Astle clearly teaches the minimization of "pulsation artifacts". Astle's col.6, lines 35-38 discloses that a block from the reference picture that matches with the current block (from current picture) will not line up along the boundaries into which the pictures are tiled, encoded and decoded. In other words, there are temporal artifacts caused by difference in compression ratios between two sequential pictures (ie. reference block versus current block). After decoding the series of encoded still images, Astle teaches that "selective filtering" can eradicate these artifacts in potentially artifactual areas without loss of important video data content (col.6, lines 51-60). Evidently, these block-edge artifacts are equivalent to the applicant's definition of pulsation artifacts because both are temporal artifacts caused by difference in compression ratios between two sequential pictures.

Regarding lines 17-20 on page 5 and the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph on page 6 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that neither Reininger, Astle nor Pearlstein teach or suggest the disabling of motion estimation and limiting motion compensation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col.8, lines 41-58, Pearlstein discloses that the use of a

refresh control processor which uses a refresh descriptor data for inhibiting frame display until a proper amount of non-erroneous image data develops for decoding. Moreover, Pearlstein discloses that until an appropriate amount of non-erroneous image data is constructed, the image data is refreshed meaning that previous image data is repetitiously sent until the complete reference frame is constructed (col.9, lines 6-19). Thus, ceasing motion estimation and limiting motion compensation until non-erroneous image data is constructed so as to display clear, high quality image data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Reininger, Astle and Pearlstein, as a whole, for stopping motion estimation and limiting motion compensation so as to enable high quality display of image data at the decoding end and to encode with precision and high efficiency. Doing so would meet with today's highly complex video encoding standards.

Regarding the last paragraph on page 6 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that Pearlstein is not relevant because Pearlstein is directed to decoding processes not encoding processes. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Clearly, it is the applicant that is misconstruing the teachings of Pearlstein. When one peruses figure 2 and 4, Pearlstein teaches the sue of an encoding unit where there is a transport encoder and a transport decoder. Clearly, Peaerlstein is very pertinent to the discussion of this case. Also, anyone of ordinary skill in the art would obviously know and recognize that if one has a set of encoding processes, then there must be a set of decoding processes that perform the opposite of the encoding processes and vice versa because both the encoding processes and the decoding process must coexist for proper functionality in

any encoding/decoding system. It is clearly elucidated that Pearlstein pertains to encoding processes, as claimed by applicant. Also, Pearlstein discloses a modulator 24 for the encoding process, as disclosed in fig.4.

Also, lines 4-8 on page 7 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that since Pearlstein discloses the intra-coded portions of pictures, there is no motion estimation and motion compensation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. If one peruses Pearlstein's fig.4, one can see that there is interframe coding when it is formatted by element 14. And anyone of ordinary skilled in the art can easily acknowledge and recognize that since Pearlstein teaches that there is interframe coding, Pearlstein teaches motion estimation and motion compensation.

To summarize, Pearlstein is relevant to the rejection of the applicant's claimed invention, as evidenced in the above remarks and in the rejection below.

Regarding the last line on page 9 to line 7 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that Reininger does not disclose the minimizing visually perceptible pulsation artifacts occurring in a sequence of still frames which are displayed after undergoing encoding and decoding of the identical frames. Please peruse the rejections and remarks from previous Office Actions: paper no. 22, dated on August 23, 2002, paper no. 20, dated on March 19, 2002, paper no. 16, dated on November 2, 2001, paper no. 13, dated on April 16, 2001, and paper no.8, dated on November 7, 2000.

Regarding pages 7-13 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Reininger et al. does not teach the "still frame". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Again, please

peruse the rejections and remarks from previous Office Actions: paper no. 22, dated on August 23, 2002, paper no. 20, dated on March 19, 2002, paper no. 16, dated on November 2, 2001, paper no. 13, dated on April 16, 2001, and paper no.8, dated on November 7, 2000.

Regarding lines 21-23 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Reininger's processes are substantially different from applicant's processes. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's figure 1 is similar to Reininger's Figure 2 where both figures have similar elements like DCT, quantization, motion estimation, variable length coders, inverse quantization, etc. And again, please peruse the rejections and remarks from previous Office Actions: paper no. 22, dated on August 23, 2002, paper no. 20, dated on March 19, 2002, paper no. 16, dated on November 2, 2001, paper no. 13, dated on April 16, 2001, and paper no.8, dated on November 7, 2000.

Regarding lines 1-2 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Reininger fails to teach or suggest the adjusting the encode process of the frame as soon as the frame is identified to comprise a still frame. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In fig.2, element 27, Reininger teaches the processor modifies at least the quantization, element 14. In other words, Reininger teaches the adjusting the encode process of the frame as soon as the frame is identified to comprise a still frame. And again, please peruse the rejections and remarks from previous Office Actions: paper no. 22, dated on August 23, 2002, paper no. 20, dated on March 19, 2002, paper no. 16,

dated on November 2, 2001, paper no. 13, dated on April 16, 2001, and paper no.8, dated on November 7, 2000.

Regarding lines 8-9 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, applicant contends that Astle does not teach the pulsation artifacts, and that the examiner misuses the term "pulsation artifacts". The examiner respectfully disagrees. On column 6, lines 25-47, Astle clearly teaches the minimization of "pulsation artifacts". Astle's col.6, lines 35-38 discloses that a block from the reference picture that matches with the current block (from current picture) will not line up along the boundaries into which the pictures are tiled, encoded and decoded. In other words, there are temporal artifacts caused by difference in compression ratios between two sequential pictures (ie. reference block versus current block). After decoding the series of encoded still images, Astle teaches that "selective filtering" can eradicate these artifacts in potentially artifactual areas without loss of important video data content (col.6, lines 51-60). Evidently, these block-edge artifacts are equivalent to the applicant's definition of pulsation artifacts because both are temporal artifacts caused by difference in compression ratios between two sequential pictures.

Regarding lines 19-21 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, Reininger already discloses the "process for adaptive encoding of a frame when the frame is a "still frame". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Please peruse the rejections and remarks from previous Office Actions: paper no. 22, dated on August 23, 2002, paper no. 20, dated on March 19, 2002, paper no. 16, dated on November 2, 2001, paper no. 13, dated on April 16, 2001, and paper no.8, dated on November 7, 2000.

Regarding lines 24-26 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Astle does not discuss "the individual frames are being decoded are still frames having content similar to the present application." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Clearly, the reference picture is a still frame and the current picture is another still frame, where the reference picture and the current picture are still pictures that can have "content similar" to one another. Also, see paper no.22.

Regarding lines 1-2 on page 13 of applicant's remarks, applicant contends that Astle does not discuss a still frame or series of encoded still frames. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Astle discloses the sequence of encoded video images or still frames (col.1, lines 13-16). Also, see paper no.22.

Regarding lines 2-3 on page 13 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Astle is not even discussing an encoding process. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Note Astle's Figure 1, element 100 is an encoding system and Figure 2, element 200 is the corresponding decoding system for encoding system 100. Also, see paper no.22.

Arguments about the disclosure of the "still frame" in Reininger have already been addressed in the previous Office Actions, paper numbers 8, 13, 16, 20 and 22. The rehashing of old, circuitous, repetitive arguments does not aid the prosecution of the case. Please reconsider the incorporation of the dependent claims 3-6, 9, 29 and 30, along with all intervening limitations, into the current independent claims because claims 3-6, 9, 29 and 30 contain patentable subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10-28 and 31-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reininger (5,426,463) in view of Astle (5,751,861) in view of Pearlstein (5,568,200).

As for claim 23, Reininger discloses a system for encoding a sequence of video frames comprising:

a pre-encode processing unit (fig.2, element 25), said pre-encoding processing unit comprising:

a statistics measurement unit for use in determining prior to encoding whether a current frame of the sequence of frames comprises a still frame, said still frame comprising a frame with content substantially identical to content of a preceding frame (fig.2, element 28 counts the number of bits that allows the determination of whether a current frame of the sequence of frames comprises a still frame or I-picture among other preceding frames; also note element 28 is inside the forward analyzer 25, and that the data obtained by the forward analyzer is used for determining proper coding iterations of each frame prior to encoding);

a control unit (fig.2, element 27; note the processor modifies at least the quantization, element 14) for modifying at least one controllable parameter (parameter being bit allocation or quantization step size) employed in encoding said still frame (ie. I-picture) between still frames of a sequence of still frames when said statistics measurement unit determines said current frame to comprise said still frame; and

an encoding engine (fig.2, element 15) is a encode engine that encodes said current frame of the sequence of video frames using the at least one controllable encode parameter set by the pre-encode processing unit, element 25) for encoding said current frame of the sequence of video frames using the at least one controllable encode parameter set by said pre-encode processing unit.

Although Reininger does not disclose the limitation “minimize after decoding thereof, visually perceptible pulsation artifacts between still frames of a sequence of still frames”, Astle discloses the elimination of the block edge artifacts (ie. pulsation artifacts) after the decoding of a series of encoded still frames or images (col.6, lines 25-47). Astle acknowledges the existence of these “artifacts” during the decoding process of a series of encoded still frames and also provides a means to eliminate these “artifacts”. Astle discloses that, more often than not, a block from the reference picture that matches with the current block will not line up along the boundaries into which pictures are tiled, encoded and decoded. In other words, when decoding image data, a still frame or a still macroblock at time t (where t is any given integer) will match, or have identical information, with a still frame or a still macroblock at time t+1. But

there would be block edge artifacts or discrepancies when the still macroblock at time t match up with the still macroblock at time t+1. However, in order to eliminate these "artifacts" after decoding the series of encoded still images, Astle teaches the concept of "selective filtering" to eliminate these artifacts in potentially artifactual or problematic areas without wasting processing time and without removing important video data content (col.6, lines 51-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the teachings of Reininger and Astle, as a whole, for expunging encoding/decoding distortions and errors so as to produce superior-quality images for display while maintaining at a highly efficient encoding rate.

Although Reininger and Astle do not disclose the limitation "to disable motion estimation and limit motion compensation", however, Pearlstein teaches the disablement of motion compensation and limiting motion compensation (in col.8, lines 41-58, Pearlstein discloses that the use of a refresh control processor which utilizes a refresh descriptor data for inhibiting frame display until an appropriate amount of non-erroneous image data develops for decoding; further, in col.9, lines 6-19, Pearlstein discloses that until an appropriate amount of non-erroneous image data is constructed, the image data is refreshed meaning that previous image data is repetitiously sent until the complete reference frame is constructed, thus, stopping motion estimation and limiting motion compensation until non-erroneous image data is constructed so as to display clear, high quality image data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Reininger, Astle and Pearlstein, as a whole, for ceasing motion estimation and limiting motion compensation so as to enable

high quality display of image data at the decoding end and to encode with precision and high efficiency. Doing so would meet with today's highly complex video encoding standards.

Note claims 1, 2, 14, 19, 20, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38 and 41 have similar corresponding elements.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 24 and 25, Reininger discloses that still picture (ie. I frame), P frame or B frame types can be determined (col.6, lines 47-54; note fig.2, element 28 counts the amount of data and makes a frame-type determination from the amount of data acquired by the counter of the pre-encoding unit, element 25).

Regarding claims 10, 26 and 39, Reininger discloses that a predictive error can be determined by the "predict" section as shown in fig. 2, element 19.

Regarding claims 11-13, 15-18, 21, 22, 27, 28, 36 and 40, Reininger discloses an I frame adaptive quantization table (fig.4), a P frame adaptive quantization table (fig.6), and a B frame adaptive quantization table (fig.5) for adaptively adjust the quantizing unit's step size so that an appropriately encoding bit rate can be used depending on the type of frame that is being determined so to avoid encoding inaccuracies or "pulsation artifact." Also, Reininger discloses that the pre-encoding unit's processor in figure 2, element 27 is used for the purpose of determining an appropriate quantization level so that a proper bit rate can be employed for encoding (col.6, lines 58-67 and col.7, lines 1-27).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 3-6, 9, 29 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (703) 306-5978. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 2613

872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final  
communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or  
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-  
4700.

Allen Wong  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2613

AW  
June 19, 2003



CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600